

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application, claims 1, 9, and 16 being independent.

Figures 12 and 13 have been amended.

Drawing Objection

The Examiner has indicated (Office Action, pg. 2), that the drawings are objected to for not containing a typed “Prior Art” label. Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to amended Figures 12 and 13, where the label “Prior Art” has been typed. Additionally the phrase “Replacement Sheet” has been added to the top margin. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of the Drawings.

Prior Art Rejections

1. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) based on Furuhashi et al. in view of Ogino et al.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furuhashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,771, herein referred to as Furuhashi) in view of Ogino et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,593,902, herein referred to as Ogino). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Furuhashi shows, suggests, or teaches an “acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with image display device” (Office Action, pg. 4) (citing Figure 1, item 131, col. 5, ll. 57-65; and col. 7, ll. 1-9) , then states that Furuhashi fails to teach an “acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location” (Office

Action, pg. 5) and states that Ogino allegedly shows such a feature and cites Ogino column 7, lines 41-54 as support. (Office Action, pg. 5)

I.) First, the Examiner states that Ogino allegedly shows an acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location and cites Ogino column 7, lines 41-54 as support.

The Examiner states: "Column 7, lines 41-54 explain that each of the display units can acquire the size of the screen, i.e., resolution and the position of each of the units, meaning a display device located at a downstream location, meaning that each display device has an "acquiring means" (Office Action, pg. 5).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. A screen in Ogino is defined as the accumulation of display units (i.e. display devices) where the resolution of the screen is defined as the number of areas in the screen, not the resolution of an individual display unit. For Example with reference to Figures 7B, and 8A-8D Ogino states:

It should be noted that, when 16 display units 101A to 101Q constitute the screen, as shown in FIG. 7B, each of the display units can also recognize a size of the screen... (Ogino, col. 7, ll. 41-43, emphasis added)

FIG. 8A shows an entire screen obtained by connecting a plurality of display units 101 to each other, and shows a state of the entire screen recognized as one area (in other words, one pixel). In this case, the number of dividing times of the screen is "0", and display resolution (in other words, the number of areas: resolution) is "1", and the number of bits required for an address for specifying this area is "0" (which indicates only one area). (Ogino, col. 7, ll. 60-67, emphasis added)

When any address information is to be set, at first, the screen shown in FIG. 8A is divided into four areas as shown in FIG. 8B, and first area addresses with two bits of "00", "01", "10", "11" each correlated to each position of the divided screens (areas a to d) are appended to the first areas' respective addresses. In this case, the number of dividing times of the screen is "1", display resolution (in other words, the number of areas) is "4", ... (Ogino, col. 8, ll. 1-8, emphasis added)

Thus as stated above, Ogino discusses the resolution of a screen, not the resolution of a display unit. Therefore the Examiner fails to provide support for Ogino allegedly having an “acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with the image display device disposed at the downstream location.”

II.) Second, the Examiner states with regard to Furuhashi that “The Examiner interprets that since the microprocessor 128 receives a command and loads data into the registers that it is acquiring resolution information from the control data processing unit 131 which receives control data from an external computer system.” (Office Action, pg. 4)

Applicant respectfully contests the interpretation of the Examiner since Furuhashi fails to state that there is an acquisition means for acquiring resolution information associated with an image display device. Rather Furuhashi discusses the input of the resolution of the display data to the controllers of the image display devices. For example Furuhashi states:

The central processing unit 1502 sends out control data ... according to the program stored in the main memory 1503. The multi-display interfaces 1518 to 1521 make the liquid crystal panels 1526 to 1529 display the display data ... according to control data transferred through the control signal bus 1514. (Furuhashi, col. 15, ll. 59-65, emphasis added)

The control data includes information to be given to the controller and specifying the display data to be given to the multi-display, (Furuhashi, col. 16, ll. 5-9, emphasis added)

... The display unit 1602 and the display unit 1604 may differ from each other in resolution. (Furuhashi, col. 16, ll. 26-33)

Display data is transferred to the first multi-display 1601 through a display data bus 1605, which corresponds to the display data bus 103 shown in FIG. 1. Control data including commands is transferred through a control signal bus 1606, which corresponds to the control signal bus 132 shown in FIG. 1. ... Display data is transferred to the second multi-display 1603 through a display data bus 1608, which corresponds to the display data bus 103 shown in FIG. 1. Control data including commands is transferred through a control signal bus 1609, which corresponds to the control signal bus 132 shown in FIG. 1. ... (Furuhashi, col. 16, ll. 34-45, emphasis added)

In operation, display data to be displayed by the first multi-display 1601 and the second multi-display 1603 are transferred beforehand or periodically from the server 1612 The controllers 1607 and 1610 send out the display data Commands associated with the display data are transferred ... to the multi-displays 1601 and 1603, respectively.
(Furuhashi, col. 16, ll. 53-61)

Each of the controllers 1607 and 1610 is able to control the plurality of liquid crystal panels simultaneously, and enlarged images corresponding to the sizes of the multi-displays 1601 and 1603 can be displayed.
(Furuhashi, col. 16, ll. 62-65)

In the multi-display, when displaying display data of a resolution lower than that of the liquid crystal panels, an enlargement rate is set in the enlargement rate specifying means for specifying an enlargement rate at which the display data read from the frame memory is to be displayed, to display the display data in an enlarged image (Furuhashi, col. 20, ll. 16-21, emphasis added)

Thus, Furuhashi discusses resolution of the display data not the acquiring of the resolution of an imaging display device. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to support his statement that Furuhashi includes an acquisition means that acquires the resolution of the image display device. Furuhashi is silent with respect to a mechanism for acquiring the resolution data of the image display device(s), which could be stored ahead of time or assumed based on model type (Although Applicant does not admit that Furuhashi employs either of these methods).

To establish a *prima facie* case obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner has the burden of meeting the following three basic criteria: (1) the prior art must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the art or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine teachings (M.P.E.P. § 2143)(emphasis added). Clearly from the discussion above the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of showing that Furuhashi, even in combination with Ogino (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), shows, suggests,

or teaches all of the features of claim 1, and for the same reasons as above, claims 9 and 16.

Claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-18, depend either directly or indirectly on claims 1, 9, and 16, and for the same reasons as above, Furuhashi, even in combination with Ogino (although Applicant does not admit either reference is combinable), fails to show, suggest, or teach all of the features of claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-18.

Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the formal objections and rejections to the claims, and the rejections based on prior art. Because all claims are believed to define over prior art of record, Applicants respectfully request an early indication of allowability.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (703) 807-3055 in the Washington D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2456 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Very truly yours,

Canon U.S.A. Inc.
Intellectual Property Department

By 
John P. Keady, PhD, Esq.
Reg. No. 56,389

JPK/tt

15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731
(408) 468-2517